UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/701,029	11/04/2003	Brian Grove	G&C 30074.50-US-U1	6164

23973   7590   02/06/2009
DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH
ATTN: INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP
ONE LOGAN SQUARE
18TH AND CHERRY STREETS
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-6996

EXAMINER
SHIFERAW, ELENI A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2436	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/06/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10/20/2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-34,36-49,51-64 and 66-78* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) *1-33* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *34,36-49,51-64 and 66-78* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 34, 36-49, 51-64 and 66-78 are presented for examination; claims 1-33 are non-elected and/or withdrawn.

Election/Restrictions

2.   Claims 1-33 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 09/28/2007.

Response to Arguments

Regarding argument the 101 rejection for claims 49, and 51-63 not being proper and/or applicant's argument wherein "each of the rejected claims contains elements as a means for performing specified functions, in accordance with 35 USC 112, and therefore recites a statutory apparatus," is not persuasive because the means plus functions are not tangible and/or the specification does not specifically describe the structures of that perform the means plus functions as being implemented by hardware structure. For instance, the specification also describes, on page 8 lines 13-page 9 lines 20 the means for retrieving, generating and transmitting as software. Therefore the rejection is proper and is maintained.

Applicant's art arguments with respect to claims 34, 36-49, 51-64 and 66-78 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 1 O1

3.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or
> composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to
> the conditions and requirements of this title.

4.   Claim 49, and 51-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because it is directed to

non-statutory subject matter as failing to fall within a statutory category and as being

directed to software per se (although the preamble of claim 1 recites a "An apparatus" it

does not inherently mean that the claim is directed to a machine). The specification also

describes, on page 8 lines 13-page 9 lines 20 the means for retrieving, generating and

transmitting as software. Therefore, claims 49, and 51-63 are software per se. See MPEP

2106.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   **Claims 34, 38-44, 49, 53-59, 64, and 68-74 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as**

being unpatentable over Iijima USPN 5225664 in view of Ho et al. US PG Pubs

20030143989 A1 and Caci et al. US Pub. 2007/0145125 A1.

Regarding claims 34, 49 and 64, Iijima discloses a method/apparatus of authenticating a

hardware token (*IC card 1*) for operation with a host (*terminal device 8*), comprising the

steps of:

retrieving a value X (col. *4 lines* 42-64; *C2X*) from a memory accessible to an

authenticating entity, the value X generated from a <u>computer</u> fingerprint F (*internal data*

NNNNN) of the host (col. 4 lines 42-50 and col. 3 lines 64-67) and an identifier P

securing access to the token, <u>wherein the host fingerprint F is computed at least in part</u>

<u>from host information C</u> (col. 4 lines 42-49 and col. 4 lines 21-26; *internal data*

NNNNN,... random number...card number/SN);

generating the identifier P at least in part from the value X and the fingerprint F

(col. 4 lines 55-63 and lines 42-49; *C2 is generated by encrypting random data B using*

key data NNNNN); and

transmitting the generated identifier P to the token to authenticate the token for

operation with the host (col. 4 lines 64-col. 5 lines 23; *C2 is transmitted to IC card for*

authentication).

Iijima fails to disclose regenerating the same identifier value P at least in part

from the value X and the fingerprint F and transmitting the regenerated identifier P.

However Ho et al. discloses generating a new same identifier based on received

information and comparing the new identifier with received identifier and communicating

based on comparing result (see par. 26, claim 27 and fig. 3 element 320, 370, 380, and

395).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention was made to modify the teachings of Ho et al. within the system of

Iijima because they are analogous in authentication. One would have been motivated to

modify the teachings to provide proper access based on authentication.

The combination of Iijima and Ho et al. fail to explicitly disclose wherein retrieving a value X from a memory separate from the token accessible to an authenticating entity, the value X generated from a **non-varying** computer fingerprint F of the host and an identifier P securing access to the token, wherein the host fingerprint F is computed at least in part from **non-varying host information C based on a unique characteristic of the host.**

However Caci et al. discloses The combination of Iijima and Ho et al. fail to explicitly disclose wherein retrieving a value X from a memory separate from the token accessible to an authenticating entity, the value X generated from a **non-varying** computer fingerprint F of the host and an identifier P securing access to the token, wherein the host fingerprint F is computed at least in part from **non-varying host information C based on a unique characteristic of the host** (see par. 51-54, claim 1 and fig. 8 and 11).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Caci et al. within the combination system because they are analogous in authentication. One would have been motivated to incorporate the teachings to secure the data.

Regarding claims 38, 53 and 68, Iijima discloses the method/apparatus, wherein the value X is computed in the token (col. 4 lines 42-49).

Regarding claims 39, 54 and 69, Iijima discloses the method/apparatus, wherein the value X is computed according to X=f(P,F), wherein f(P,F) is a reversible function such that

f(f(P,F),F)=P (col. 3 lines 56-col. 4 lines 64).

Regarding claims 40, 55 and 70, Iijima discloses the method/apparatus, wherein f(P,F)

comprises P XOR F (col. 3 lines 56-col. 4 lines 64).

Regarding claims 41, 56 and 71, Iijima discloses the method/apparatus, wherein the value

X is further computed at least in part from a user identifier U (col. 2 lines 43-62).

Regarding claims 42, 57 and 72, Iijima discloses the method/apparatus, wherein the value

X is computed according to X=f(P,U,F), wherein f(P,U,F) is a reversible function such

that f(f(P,U,F),U,F)=P (col. 3 lines 56-col. 4 lines 64).

Regarding claims 43, 58 and 73, Iijima discloses the method/apparatus, wherein

f(P,U,F) is P XOR U XOR F (col. 3 lines 56-col. 4 lines 64).

Regarding claims 44, 59 and 74, Iijima discloses the method/apparatus, wherein: the

authorizing entity is a host computer communicatively coupleable to the token; and the

value X is stored in the host computer (fig. 1 elements 1 and 8).

7.   **Claims 45-48, 60-63, and 75-78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being**

unpatentable over Iijima USPN 5225664, Ho et al. US PG Pubs 20030143989 A1 and

Caci et al. US Pub. 2007/0145125 A1 and further in view of Miura USPN 6952775

B1.

Regarding claims 45, 60 and 75, Iijima fails to disclose hashing. However Miura

discloses the method/apparatus of IC card 103 authentication (see fig. 1) and the

authentication comprising hashing multiple entity's personal information (see fig. 6-7),

storing the computed hash value (col. 2 lines 64-col. 3 lines 7). Therefore it would have

been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made

to modify the teachings of Miura within the combination system to compute a hash value

of value x because computing a hash value of authenticating data is well known at the

time of the invention for authentication.

Regarding claims 46, 61 and 76, Miura discloses the method/apparatus of IC card 103

authentication (see fig. 1) and the authentication comprising hashing multiple entity's

personal information (see fig. 6-7), storing the computed hash value (col. 2 lines 64-col. 3

lines 7). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at

the time of the invention was made to modify the teachings of Miura within the

combination system to compute a hash value of in part from the fingerprint F; and

retrieving the value X associated with the reference value H because computing a hash

value of authenticating data is well known at the time of the invention for authentication.

Regarding claims 47, 62 and 77, Miura discloses the method/apparatus of IC card 103

authentication (see fig. 1) and the authentication comprising hashing multiple entity's

personal information (see fig. 6-7), storing the computed hash value (col. 2 lines 64-col. 3

lines 7). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teachings of Miura within the combination system to compute a hash value of in part from the fingerprint F; and retrieving the value X associated with the reference value H because computing a hash value of authenticating data is well known at the time of the invention for authentication.

Regarding claims 48, 63 and 78, Miura discloses the method/apparatus of IC card 103 authentication (see fig. 1) and the authentication comprising hashing multiple entity's personal information (see fig. 6-7), storing the computed hash value (col. 2 lines 64-col. 3 lines 7). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teachings of Miura within the combination system to compute a hash value of in part from the fingerprint F; and retrieving the value X associated with the reference value H because computing a hash value of authenticating data is well known at the time of the invention for authentication.

8.   Claims 36-37, 51-52, and 66-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iijima USPN 5225664, Ho et al. US PG Pubs 20030143989 A1 and Caci et al. US Pub. 2007/0145125 A1 and further in view of Ayyagari et al. 2003/0208677.

Regarding claims 36, 51 and 66, Iijima teaches wherein the host fingerprint F is computed at least in part from host information C (see col. 3 lines 56-col. 4 lines 64) but fails to disclose wherein the host fingerprint F is computed at least in part from a server specific value V. However Ayyagari et al. discloses identifier information comprising a

concatenated hardware address of the access server and a hardware address of a client.

There fore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the invention was made to modify the teachings of Ayyagari et al. with in the

combination system because they are analogous in authentication. One would have been

motivated to incorporate the teachings to include the remote server within the

authentication.

Regarding claims 37, 52 and 67, Iijima teaches wherein the host fingerprint F is

computed at least in part from host information C and a fixed string Z (see col. 3 lines 56-

col. 4 lines 64) but fails to disclose wherein the host fingerprint F is computed at least in

part from a server specific value V and a fixed string Z. However Ayyagari et al.

discloses identifier information comprising a concatenated hardware address of the access

server and a hardware address of a client. Therefor it would have been obvious to one

having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the

teachings of Ayyagari et al. with in the combination system because they are analogous

in authentication. One would have been motivated to incorporate the teachings to include

the remote server within the authentication.

Conclusion

9.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the

advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than

SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Eleni A. Shiferaw whose telephone number is 571-272-

3867. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Nasser R. Moazzami can be reached on (571) 272-4195. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-

8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO

Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call

800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Eleni A Shiferaw/

Examiner, Art Unit 2436

/Nasser G Moazzami/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2436